

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 16-26, 28, 29, 31, 35 and 38-45 remain pending in this application, with Claims 1, 10, 11, 14, 17, 26, 29, 35 and 44 being independent. Claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 22, 26, 28, 29, 31, 35, and 44 been amended herein.

Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 16-26, 28, 29, 31, 35, and 38-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182 (Nehab et al.) in view of traditional client/server architecture (official notice). This rejection is again respectfully traversed.

Support for the changes to the claims can be found in the specification at least at page 13, lines 12-15. Of course, the claims are not intended to be limited in scope to this preferred embodiment.

As described previously, the website data retrieval system of Nehab et al. includes computing equipment 1, such as a personal computer. Within the computing equipment 1 is a web printer 17, which can acquire personal-news-profile 19 from disk 5 and generate a personalized newspaper based on the personal-news-profile and outputs the newspaper to printer 7 or display 2 via output interface 40. The personal-news-profile 19 includes information as to what sites to access for creating the personalized newspaper, what sections to retrieve from those sites, rules to use to determine what data to extract

from the sections and the articles therein, rules to determine how to exclude links, and newspaper format information.

The Office Action suggests that the personal-new-profile of Nehab et al. “includes both the content to be included as well as layout information.” However, Applicant submits that the personal-news-profile does not include any information concerning a recording medium. That is, Nehab et al. describes that the personal-news-profile includes address data for a site on the hypermedia-linked computer network, command data for accessing data from the site, and newspaper layout commands. The address data and the command data are not information concerning the recording medium. As to newspaper layout commands, Nehab et al. describes that the linear document is formatted into the personalized newspaper according to newspaper layout commands stored in the personal-news-profile. Nehab et al. does not specify whether the information concerning a recording medium is included or not. Although Figures 9A-9C of Nehab et al. show that “Styles”, “Columns” and “Spacing” can be designated, there is no disclosure or suggestion of designating any information concerning the recording medium.

Therefore, Nehab et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least that layout information includes information on the recording medium having a predetermined size and that an external apparatus generates data for output, wherein the image based on the data for output can be accommodated in the predetermined size based on the acquired data and the sent layout information, as is recited in independent Claim 1. Nor does Nehab et al. disclose or suggest similar features recited in independent Claims 10, 11, 14, 17, 26, 29,

and 35. Furthermore, Nehab et al. does not disclose or suggest that the layout information indicates a specific size, as is recited in independent Claim 44.

Thus, Nehab et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

While Applicant does not dispute the existence of “traditional client/server architecture”, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not reconstruct the system of Nehab et al. in the manner suggested by the Office Action. Nevertheless, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the system of Nehab et al. could be reconstructed as a client/server system, such a reconstruction would still fail to meet the deficiencies of Nehab et al. noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Accordingly, the independent claims are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1, 10, 11, 14, 17, 26, 29, 35 and 44. Dependent Claims 2-9, 13, 16, 18-25, 28, 31, 38-43 and 45 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW:ytr

FCIS_WS 1396911v1